DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 059 031 RE 004 009

TITLE	An Interim Report of a Summer Institute in Teaching Reading: An Eclectic Approach to Reading.
INSTITUTION	District of Columbia Public Schools, Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE	Mar 70
NOTE	44p.
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS	Class Organization; *Content Reading; *Inservice Teacher Education; Intermediate Grades; Interpersonal Relationship; Parent Participation; Participant Satisfaction; Program Evaluation; Questionnaires; *Reading Instruction; Reading Skills; *Summer Programs; Teacher Aides; *Teaching Techniques

ABSTRACT

A 4-weeks summer reading institute with emphasis on reading skills in the content areas was held in 1969. The program was designed for teachers and students from grades 4 to 6, parents, innovation team members, and teacher aides from the Model School Division. Intensive effort was made to provide teachers with special skills in classroom organization, teaching methodology, and the use of current materials and programs. Content reading skills were highlighted through establishment of curriculum laboratories in mathematics, social studies, and science. Teachers were introduced to language experience, linguistics, and individualized reading instruction techniques. The first days of the Institute were spent in establishing interpersonal relationships to emphasize effects of personal interactions in the teaching-learning situation. An evaluation instrument was designed and administered to the participants to seek background information and to assess individual attitudes and expectations. A student checklist was also given to participating children. Response data were analyzed are reported in detail. Tables and appendixes are included. (AW)

ED 059031

N-SG
RE

AN INTERIM REPORT

OF

A SUMMER INSTITUTE IN TEACHING READING

AN ECLECTIC APPROACH TO READING

Sponsored by

THE INNOVATION TEAM

of the

MODEL SCHOOL DIVISION

Raymond School
Washington, D. C.
July 7 - August 1, 1969

U. S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

Prepared by
Department of Research and Evaluation
Division of Planning, Innovation and Research
March, 1970

RE 004 009

Acting Superintendent of Schools	Benjamin J. Henley
Deputy Superintendent for Instruction	Norman W. Nickens
Asst. Superintendent - Model School Division	Gilbert A. Diggs
Acting Division Head, Division of Planning, Innovation and Research	Mildred P. Cooper

The Innovation Team

Irving Gordy	Project Leader
Annie W. Neal	Director of Institute
Flora Hill	Administrative Assistant
Veola Jackson	Documentarian
Lillian Neville	Team Leader
Louise Boone	Team Leader
Maxi Wooten	Team Leader
Mary Alexander	Team Leader
Donald Greene	Group Leader
Joan Brown	Group Leader
Ralph Jenkins	Group Leader
Jacqueline Robertson	Social Studies Laboratory
W. Joseph Hunter	Cardboard Carpentry
Earl T. Beam	Mathematics Laboratory
Ralph Jenkins	Science Laboratory
Vernon Redd	Secretary
Joan Manigault	Classroom Teacher
Donnie Watkins	Classroom Teacher
Arylene Fisher	Classroom Teacher
Gloria Downs	Classroom Teacher
Judy Evans	Consultant

Other Staff

Robert Humbles, Jr.	Evaluation Research Associate
George R. Taylor	Evaluation Research Associate
Josefina Ordonez	Evaluation Research Associate
Rozelia M. Stewart	Clerical Assistance
Edna McDonald	Clerical Assistance

This report was prepared by the:

Department of Research and Evaluation
Division of Planning, Innovation and Research
D. C. Public Schools

Dr. Mildred P. Cooper, Acting Division Head

Robert Humbles, Jr., Evaluation and Research Associate and
Representative and Study Coordinator

George R. Taylor, Evaluation and Research Associate

Josefina Ordonez, Evaluation and Research Associate

READING INSTITUTE - RAYMOND SCHOOL

A summer reading institute, "An Eclectic Approach to Reading," with emphasis on reading skills in the content area, was held at the Raymond School, 10th and Spring Road, N. W., June 23 - August 1, 1969. The program was designed for teachers and students from grades 4 through 6, parents, Innovation Team members, and teacher aides from the Model School Division.

During the four weeks an intensive effort was made to provide teachers of these grades with special skills in classroom organization, teaching methodology, and the use of current materials and programs which would enable them to integrate reading and language arts in the total program.

The Innovation Team felt a need for some on-going evaluation of the project planned and implemented by them. Therefore, they asked the Department of Research and Evaluation to provide help. A meeting was held between representatives of the Innovation Team and members of the Department of Research and Evaluation at the Presidential Building in early June, 1969. At that meeting, the Innovation Team representatives explained their objectives and the means for getting them accomplished. A discussion of some concerns laid the groundwork for subsequent meetings.

A number of additional meetings were held at the Raymond School in order to discuss, plan, and formulate criteria for the evaluation that would follow.

Agreement was reached that members of the department would actively carry out the evalution with the aid of the Innovation Team.

One aspect of the Summer Institute was to hold a three day workshop for the purpose of establishing inter-personal relationships. This three day session involved all adult participants and two members from the

Department of Research and Evaluation. Two categories of objectives were formulated for the overall program which would extend through the summer component and the school year 1969-1970. The summer objectives were:

1. To develop a viable working relationship among participants for planning, organizing and decision-making during the Institute.
2. To acquaint participants with the Language Experience, Linguistic and Individualized Approaches to Reading.
3. To enable participants to begin to develop a plan for their school year reading program.
4. To acquaint parents with some of the methods used to help children learn to read.
5. To involve parents in the total learning process.

The above objectives were listed as the five objectives that would receive priority treatment during the Summer Institute. The long range objectives that would be evaluated during the school year appear below. They are as follows:

1. To develop in the participants an awareness of their roles and actions, and how these roles affect children as learners.
2. To develop in the participants the ability to draw from many approaches, to choose materials appropriate to the children's instructional needs and to utilize these materials in teaching skills in the content areas.
3. To develop in participants the facility for dealing with specified types of audio-visual materials and equipment introduced during the Summer Institute, for example - Polaroid cameras, micro-projectors, film projectors, etc.

4. To train teachers to increase the number and use of activity-oriented centers within the classrooms. (Children's use of materials and equipment).
5. To increase the emphasis on the teacher as a resource rather than an authority figure so that students become more self-reliant.
6. To increase student-student and student-teacher interaction and movement.
7. To develop the teachers' competencies in the use of the following resources:
   a. Workshops
   b. Team Members
   c. Other Teachers
   d. Parents and other community people
   e. Resource people within the system (supervisors, special teachers, etc.)
   f. Outside Consultants
   g. Professional materials, e.g., books, articles, etc.

In an effort to make an evaluation of the Reading Institute Workshop held at Raymond School, the Department of Evaluation and Research designed an instrument entitled "An Opinionnaire to the Participants of the Summer Reading Institute - Raymond School". This instrument was designed for the purpose of getting the participants to react to conditions and circumstances that were part of the Institute. It was divided into three categories: (1) background information (2) assessing individual attitudes and (3) expectations.

Description of the Instrument

Part one of the instrument gathered background information about the participants; such as:

1. Identification of work classification.
2. Sex and age.
3. Work experience in a school setting.
4. Present grades, preferred grades.
5. Attendance at workshops.
6. Content area of workshops.
7. Personal reactions and recommendations for workshops.

Part two of the instrument was designed to assess initial attitudes of the persons who participated. The responses to the formulated statements were: Strongly Agree, Agree, Disagree, Strongly Disagree.

Part three of the instrument was designed to assess each participant's expectations from the Institute. A copy of the instrument is included in the appendix of this report.

Procedures

During the second week of the Institute the instrument was administered to the participants. Oral directions were given. Summarized data from those participants who completed the instrument appear in tabular and narrative form.

TABLE I

Selected Characteristics of Participants
Percent Figured By Type of Participant

Type of Participant	Teacher		Aide		Innov. Team		Parent	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
1. Sex:								
a. Male	8	21%	1	10%	1	17%	0	0
b. Female	30	79%	9	90%	5	83%	5	100%
TOTAL	38		10		6		5	
2. Age:								
a. Under 20	0	0	6	55%	0	0	0	0
b. 20-25	8	22%	2	18%	0	0	0	0
c. 26-30	13	35%	0	0	1	17%	1	20%
d. Over 30	16	43%	3	27%	5	83%	4	80%
TOTAL	37		11		6		5	
4a. Work Experience								
a. None	0	0	5	39%	0	0	2	50%
b. Approx. 1 year	1	3%	0	0	0	0	1	25%
c. Less than 3 yrs., more than 1 yr.	7	21%	0	0	0	0	0	0
d. 4-5 years	6	17%	2	15%	1	17%	0	0
e. 6-10 years	13	38%	2	15%	2	33%	1	25%
f. More than 10 years	7	21%	4	31%	3	50%	0	0
TOTAL	34		13		6		4	
4b. Teaching Experience								
a. None	0	0	6	86%	0	0	2	67%
b. Approx. 1 year	3	8%	0	0	1	14%	0	0
c. Less than 3 years, more than 1 year	6	16%	0	0	0	0	0	0
d. 4-5 years	6	16%	0	0	1	14%	0	0
e. 6-10 years	11	30%	1	14%	1	14%	1	33%
f. More than 10 years	11	30%	0	0	4	57%	0	0
TOTAL	37		7		7		3	

Table I is entitled "Selected Characteristics of Participants." It summarizes information requested in questions 1, 2, 3, 4a, 4b, & 13. A brief summary of the table reveals the following information:

Thirty-eight teachers, ten aides (three of whom were T.A.P. and seven from the Mayor's Youth Council), six Innovation Team members, and five parents filled out a questionnaire.

The most important indication as revealed by Table I deals with work and teaching experience. The majority of the participants had more than five years of work experience; either in school or in some other area.

TABLE II

A Summary of Grade Level Worked With As Opposed to Grade Level Preferred

Type of Participants	Grade Worked With					Grade Preferred				
	4th	5th	6th	Comb.	Other	4th	5th	6th	Comb.	Other
Teacher	13	14	7	3	1	11	14	7	4	2
Aide	..	..	..	2	4	..	..	1	3	4
Innov. Team	..	..	..	3	3	..	..	..	2	2
Parent	1	..	..	1	..	2	..	..	2	..

Table II presents a summary of the grade with which participants worked as contrasted with the grade which participants preferred to work. The responses in numbers show very little variation between the actual grades worked with and the grades preferred.

TABLE III

A Comparative Analysis of the Grade With Which Teachers Work As Contrasted to the Grade With Which the Teachers Preferred Working

	Grade Preferred						
Grade Taught	4th	5th	6th	Comb.	Other	Total	%
4th	10	1	...	...	1	12	83.3
5th	1	11	...	3	...	15	73.3
6th	...	...	7	...	...	7	100.0
Comb.	...	2	1	...	...	3	33.3

Table III makes a comparative analysis of the grade with which teachers presently work as contrasted to grade with which teachers preferred working. It indicates that there was little desire for a change of grade by the teachers. Those who taught a combination grade were least satisfied.

TABLE IV

A Summary of Summer School and Workshop Experience of Participants by Years

Participant	Years Worked in Summer School							Years Enrolled in a Summer Institute					No. of Workshops Attended Last School Year				
	0	1	2	3	4	5	more than 5	0	1	2	3	more than 3	0	1	2	3	more than 3
Teacher	20	4	7	4	2	0	1	15	9	5	8	1	6	5	6	6	15
Aide	5	1	0	4	0	0	0	7	2	0	0	1	8	1	0	0	1
Innov. Team	0	0	1	0	0	2	1	0	0	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	4
Parent	3	0	0	2	0	0	0	4	0	0	1	0	3	0	2	0	0

Table IV presents a summary of all summer school and last year's workshop experiences of participants and parents.

Fifty-seven participants responded to the question regarding number of of years worked in summer school; twenty-eight participants had no years of summer school work experience. Out of the fifty-five participants who responded to number of years enrolled in a summer institute, more than half had done this. Forty participants attended one or more workshops last school year.

This leads one to believe that the group involved was certainly one that kept involved in summer school work, summer institutes and current educational workshops. This is highly commendable.

TABLE V

Scheduling of Workshops

Preferences	Teachers	Aides	Innov. Team	Parent	Total
Beginning of School Year	25	5	2	...	32
Semester break	1	...	...	1	2
Closing of School	1	1	...	...	2
Summer	13	5	1	3	22
Other	5	...	3	...	8
Weekday, 8:30 - 3:00	23	3	6	2	34
Weekday, Half day	14	4	...	1	19
Weekday, 8:30 - 5:00	...	2	...	1	3
Weekday, 7:30 - 9:30 p.m.	...	...	...	...	0
Saturday, Half day	1	...	...	...	1
Saturday, All day	1	...	...	...	1

Table V,"Scheduling of Workshops"reveals that the majority of the participants preferred all day sessions at the beginning of the school year as the time for scheduling workshops. It would appear that a large number of these participants see a real need for holding in-service workshops. If implemented, this idea would be very much in line with the Passow recommendations.

Analysis of Open-Ended Questions

This section of the report will analyze responses to the open-ended questions from the opinionnaire.

When participants responded to the type of workshops or institutes they had attended, the following were listed:

1. Mathematics Institute
2. Reading Institute
3. Social Studies Institute
4. Science Institute
5. Polaroid Workshop
6. Preschool Child and Psychology Workshop
7. Interpersonal Relations Institute
8. Census Meeting Workshop
9. Creative Dance Workshop
10. Workshop for New Teachers
11. Garrison School Institute
12. Black Awareness Workshop

13. Africa Workshop
14. Socially Deprived Child Workshop
15. Music Institute
16. Individualized Instruction Workshop
17. Teaching Children's Needs Workshop
18. Language Workshop
19. Tri-Wall Workshop

The Evaluation Team observed that the Innovation Team used some of the same content areas to implement the eclectic approach to reading, mathematics, social studies, science, use of Polaroid cameras, Black Awareness, language development, music, and creative dance.

What was the most exciting new idea that you learned during the three day workshop? Since the opinionnaire was administered during the second week, the listed items not only reflect the most exciting things learned the first three days but include more.

1. Respect for the child and his needs
2. Allowing problem students to participate in classroom activities
3. Beginning instruction at the child's level
4. Do not suppress the child
5. Reading to the child who doesn't like to participate by doing
6. Encouraging the child to extend his own interests
7. Working with new people
   a. discussions with other teachers
   b. working with all school personnel
   c. an openness to attitudinal changes
   d. better understanding between people
   e. getting to know people
   f. tools in communication
8. Science
   a. science materials
   b. games about space

9. Use of Polaroid Camera
10. Mathematics
11. Book-making
12. Social Studies
13. Skills in reading
14. Haiku (a type of Japanese poetry)
15. Pre-school music, finger play and counting

Participants were then asked to list what they perceived as their greatest obstacles in carrying out the objectives established in their groups, once they had actually begun work in the classroom in September.

1. Lack of materials.
2. Administrative blocks.
3. Too many children.
4. Lack of parent participation.
5. Insufficient aides.
6. Lack of cooperation by aides.
7. Aides not having enough time to spend in the classroom.
8. Getting children interested in the program.
9. Program tends to be too unstructed.
10. Setting up a criteria for discipline.

It is suggested that the Innovation Team should concentrate its efforts in helping minimize the obstacles that teachers may encounter.

Opinionnaire - Part II

Part II of the opinionnaire administered to participants sought to determine initial attitudes. General statements were written about school, teaching and education policies. The directions were to check on a scale how each one felt regarding the statements made.

Table VI

A Summary of the Opinions and Attitudes of Participants Regarding School-Related Activities

	Agree		Disagree		Total
	No.	%	No.	%	No.
1. My reason for becoming involved in school-related work is because:					
a) of an interest in children	60	100	0	0	60
b) of financial benefits	30	56.6	23	43.4	53
c) of many avenues of employment	18	38.3	29	61.7	47
d) of much academic freedom	33	64.7	18	35.3	51
e) it makes for democratic living	36	69.2	16	30.8	52
f) it is a way to contribute to society	47	85.5	8	14.5	55
2. In the District of Columbia teachers are:					
a) highly regarded by parents	25	43.1	33	56.9	58
b) not regarded as professionals in the community	30	53.6	26	46.4	56
c) highly regarded by students	27	45.8	32	54.2	59
d) highly regarded by the community	25	45.5	30	54.5	55
e) highly regarded among themselves	30	55.6	24	44.4	54
3. The effectiveness of teaching in D. C. should be measured by:					
a) children's achievement	45	80.4	11	19.6	56
b) children's acceptance without questioning the teacher	9	16.4	46	83.6	55
c) changes in the attitudes of children	47	90.4	5	9.6	52
d) children's interaction with others	50	87.7	7	12.3	57
e) children's ability to adjust to new situations	46	76.7	14	23.3	60
f) all children making high marks	8	14.5	47	85.5	55
4. The success of any educational program designed for inner-city youngsters depends upon:					
a) provision of material goods to students	50	86.2	8	13.8	58
b) the cooperative efforts of school personnel and community workers	64	91.4	6	8.6	70
c) use of paraprofessionals	47	92.2	4	7.8	51
d) relevant curriculum	50	90.9	5	9.1	55
e) strongly structured classroom setting	24	44.4	30	55.6	54
5. Many people feel that for a number of reasons there should be more male teachers in the District of Columbia because:					
a) inner city children relate faster to males	28	53.8	24	46.2	52
b) there is an absence of a strong male image in many homes	55	96.5	2	3.5	57

	Agree		Disagree		Total
	No.	%	No.	%	No.
5. (continued)					
c) male teachers tend to be stronger disciplinarians	26	46.4	30	53.6	56
d) male teachers are more sincerely committed to the teaching profession	10	18.2	45	81.8	55
e) male teachers are better teachers in inner-city classrooms	11	20.4	53	79.6	54
6 The achievement scores of inner-city youngersters should be compared with:					
a) own peers	50	89.3	6	10.7	56
b) local community	46	92.0	4	8.0	50
c) urban cities	25	50.0	25	50.0	50
d) national norms	11	22.0	39	78.0	50
7. Existing standardized achievment tests should be:					
a) used	12	23.5	39	76.5	51
b) eliminated	29	58.0	21	42.0	50
c) modified	36	70.6	15	29.4	51
d) entirely changed	38	73.1	14	26.9	52
8. It is my feeling that inner city children in D. C. generally achieve faster than children from:					
a) better environments	3	6.5	43	93.5	46
b) slower than children from other environments	31	64.6	17	35.4	48
c) as well as children from other environments	26	54.2	22	45.8	48
9. Teaching techniques with inner city children should be:					
a) life like	52	94.5	3	5.5	55
b) flexible	56	96.6	2	3.4	58
c) highly structured	18	40.9	26	59.1	44
d) range from simple to difficult	50	89.3	6	10.7	56
10. I feel that the classroom teacher should be:					
a) an authority figure	20	37.7	33	62.3	53
b) a resource person	54	98.2	1	1.8	55
c) a substitute parent	23	43.4	30	56.6	53
d) a moderator rather than a giver of information	38	67.9	18	32.1	56

Table VI shows the statements made and records totals and percentages of participants. It should be noted that only two categories appear at this point. The categories Strongly Agree and Strongly Disagree were combined with the categories - Agree and Disagree in order to present only positive and negative reactions.

Opinionnaire - Part III

Part III was designed to get participants' expectations from the Summer Reading Institute.

TABLE VII

EXPECTATIONS OF PARTICIPANTS

STATEMENTS	Very Well		Well		Not Well		Not well at all		Total
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	
1. Help me identify children's needs.	26	46.4	26	46.4	3	5.4	1	1.8	56
2. Give clues for understanding children's needs.	23	48.9	22	46.8	2	4.3	0	0	47
3. Provide possible solutions to meet children's needs.	28	49.1	27	47.4	2	3.5	0	0	57
4. Develop ways of motivating children.	28	50.0	26	46.4	2	3.6	0	0	56
5. Provide varied and innovative gimmicks for motivating inner-city children.	22	38.6	31	54.4	3	5.3	1	1.7	57
6. Provide innovative teaching techniques in reading and other content areas.	34	59.6	22	38.6	1	1.8	0	0	57
7. Give training in the use of devices used to measure academic growth of children.	15	26.8	31	55.4	6	10.7	4	7.1	56
8. Provide help in assessing attitudes of teachers, students, school personnel, and parents.	15	26.3	33	57.9	5	8.8	4	7.0	57
9. Provide training that will lead to a change in attitude.	21	37.5	27	48.2	7	12.5	1	1.8	56

STATEMENTS	Very Well		Well		Not Well		Not well at all		Total
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	
. Make all participants aware of the need for self-evaluation.	22	38.6	30	52.6	3	5.3	2	3.5	57
. Promote better working relationships for entire school staff.	18	31.6	31	54.4	7	12.3	1	1.7	57
. Improve working relationships with parents and other community agencies.	22	38.6	33	57.9	1	1.7	1	1.8	57
. Make school personnel aware of varied school and community resources.	14	25.9	28	51.8	11	20.4	1	1.9	54
. Promote a sharing of ideas, techniques, and physical resources.	29	52.7	26	47.3	0	0	0	0	55
. Identify varied audio visual equipment.	18	33.3	30	55.6	5	9.2	1	1.9	54
. Develop skills in the use of new audio-visual equipment.	16	28.6	33	58.9	6	10.7	1	1.8	56
. Instruct use of classroom centers as a laboratory of learning rather than a beautifying fixture in the classroom.	33	60.	19	34.6	1	1.8	2	3.6	55
. Instruct in the development of reasonable behavioral objectives.	13	24.5	31	58.5	7	13.2	2	3.8	53
. Teach use of behavioral objectives in making long and short-range plans.	10	18.9	26	49.1	14	26.4	3	5.6	53
. Serve as a motivator for the regular school year program.	25	45.5	29	52.7	1	1.8	0	0	55

A comparison of pre and post data cannot be made at this point, since the post rument will be administered in early fall. At that time a comparative analysis will ade of the collected sets of data.

Table VII shows the total ranks and percentages for each of the twenty statements. It should be noted that the percentages in the positive columns (very well and well) are much higher than are the percentages recorded in the negative columns (not well and not well at all). This indicates that participants came expecting a great deal from the institute.

The participants were asked to list recommendations for holding institutes similar to the one they were attending. The statements below were recommendations which could improve future summer institutes.

1. Plan institutes of the same sort but use fewer adult participants per child.
2. Plan science institutes.
3. Plan more institutes and open them to everyone.
4. Involve other school personnel as participants.
5. Provide demonstrations with a group of children from start to finish.
6. Introduce follow-up as a part of the institute.
7. Provide for more structure and direction within the institute.
8. Involve more people.
9. Plan a workshop with two weeks of workshops with consultants before bringing children into the program.
10. Provide for more materials - Listening Centers, tape recorders, etc.
11. Use city resources in the classroom.
12. Provide for more time.
13. Extend the institute throughout the school year.
14. Hold more large group discussions with follow-up in team groups.
15. Provide personnel to explain and demonstrate materials of the institute.
16. Place more emphasis on reading skills.
17. Make a concentrated effort to improve interpersonal relationships.

18. Be certain to provide time periods for "group conversations."

19. Provide a sheet listing all materials on the market so that teachers can order materials from regular allotted funds.

20. Plan for additional mathematics institutes.

21. Plan for additional reading institutes.

22. Plan for additional social studies institutes and relate to other subjects.

23. Provide workshops for Head Start Programs.

Summary

The Reading Institute conducted at Raymond School July 7 through August 1, 1969, was composed of the following staff:

a. 11 Innovation Team Members divided in this manner:

2 administrative leaders

4 curriculum laboratory leaders

1 documentarian

4 team leaders

b. 38 teachers

c. 7 Youth Aides (Mayor's Office)

d. 3 T.A.P. aides

e. 4 Classroom Instructors

f. 1 Librarian

The Institute served thirty-five boys and forty-six girls. Hot lunches and milk were served daily.

During the four weeks, July 7 through August 1, 1969, an intensive effort was made to provide teachers of grades four through six from the schools in the Model School Division (Bancroft, Bundy, Cleveland, H.D. Cooke, Garrison, Grimke, Harrison, Meyer, Monroe, Morse, Parkview and Raymond) with special skills in classroom organization, teaching methodology, and knowledge of the use of current materials and programs so as to enable them to integrate reading and language arts in a total school program.

At the beginning of the Institute a three day session was arranged for the sole purpose of getting participants to adopt a "feeling" for the remaining days of the Institute. It was really providing training for the purpose of developing good human relations among all involved. It proved most satisfactory; for after the three days of training, rapport had been

established and groups had become organized. Concentration was on the effects of personal interactions in the teaching - learning situation as found in the home, school, and community.

Emphasis was placed on reading throughout the Institute. Reading skills in the content areas were highlighted through the establishment of curriculum laboratories in mathematics, social studies and science. Teachers were introduced to a variety of techniques for working with children. They were: the Language Experience Approach, the Linguistic Approach and Individualized Reading. Teachers and students were taught to use the Polaroid camera as a media for motivating youngsters to learn. There was a Cardboard Carpentry laboratory in which furniture and other items were made for use in the classrooms and homes. Those new experiences provided indicated innovative ways and techniques for challenging children to learn.

STUDENT SUMMARY

A student checklist was administered to the children who participated in the Summer Institute in order to gather some information about who the children were, there they came from, and what kinds of things they did.

The next few pages will present an overall description of these children. The checklist was administered by the documentarian, a member of the Innovation Team staff. It included a sampling of twenty-one boys and thirty-five girls. They were asked to note grade completed for the school year 1968-69. Thirteen students stated they had completed fourth grade, twelve had completed fifth grade, eight had completed sixth grade, twenty-three had completed some other grade. The ages of the majority of the participants ranged from seven to thirteen. Two students were seven, six were eight, ten were nine, eight were ten, ten were eleven, eleven were twelve, six were thirteen, and three were older.

Student Responses

How many summers have you attended summer school?

Response	Number and percent responding	
None	17	33.0%
One year	13	25.5%
Two years	16	31.4%
Three years	3	5.9%
More than three years	2	3.9%

Did you enjoy summer school last year?

Response	Number and percent responding	
Lot	26	86.7%
Some what	4	13.3%
Not at all	0	0%

Do you think you will enjoy summer school this summer?

Response	Number and percent responding	
Lot	50	94.3%
Somewhat	2	3.8%
Not at all	1	1.9%

Did you like your teacher last summer?

Response	Number and percent responding	
Lot	27	90.0%
Somewhat	2	6.7%
Not at all	1	3.3%

Do you think you will like your teacher this summer?

Response	Number and percent responding	
Lot	53	96.3%
Somewhat	2	3.7%
Not at all	0	--

Was your teacher last school year a man or a woman?

Response	Number and percent responding	
Man	13	23.7%
Woman	39	70.9%
Had both	3	5.4%

What do you like best about summer?

Response	Number and percent responding	
Going swimming	22	28.2%
Staying at home	1	1.3%
Going to summer school	23	29.5%
Taking a vacation with your parents	32	41.0%
Other	1	

What is your favorite subject?

Response	Number and percent responding	
Reading	15	25.0%
Mathematics	19	31.7%
Language Arts	7	11.6%
Science	14	23.3%

Should children go to summer school?

Response	Number and percent responding	
Yes	52	94.5%
No	3	5.5%

Do your parents want you to go to summer school?

Response	Number and percent responding	
Yes	51	92.7%
No	4	7.3%

How many brothers and sisters do you have going to summer school this summer?

Response	Number and percent responding	
None	26	45.6%
One	15	26.3%
Two	13	22.8%
Three	2	3.5%
More than three	1	1.8%

Which teacher would you prefer having?

Response	Number and percent responding	
A young lady	44	71.0%
An older lady	7	11.3%
A young man	11	17.7%
An older man	0	0%

I am going to summer school because:

Response	Number and percent responding	
I did poorly last year	3	5.3%
I want to learn more	29	50.9%
My parents wanted me to attend	9	15.8%
I like school	10	17.5%
I had nothing else to do	5	8.8%
Other	1	1.8%

Would you have liked summer school to have started earlier in the summer?

Response	Number and percent responding	
Yes	37	67.3%
No	18	32.7%

If you could do anything you wanted this summer, what would you do?

Response	Number and percent responding	
Recreation	20	35.7%
Travel	25	44.6%
Education	11	19.6%

What did you do the week before summer school began?

Response	Number and percent responding	
Traveled	4	7.1%
Played	24	42.9%
Watched T.V.	9	16.1%
School Work	17	30.4%
Went to Camp	2	3.6%

Note: Children listed all sorts of things. They have been categorized into three areas which reflect how children responded.

Pupils were asked if they had been to summer school before attending the 1969 session. Thirty-three stated that they had, twenty-three stated that they had not attended summer school on a previous occasion. The schools represented by students at the Summer Institute included the following: Raymond, Rudolph, Takoma, Monroe, Bunker Hill, Langdon, Bruce, Blow-Pierce, Brent, Keene, Parkview, and Truesdell, all public schools of the District of Columbia. The non-public school represented at the Summer Institute was St. Gabriel's. There was also present at the Institute one pupil from the Meyer School who had been bussed to the Bannockburn School in Montgomery County. Participants of the summer institute were permitted to enroll their children.

The large number of schools represented at the Summer Institute again brought many interesting experiences for all involved.

Pupils were asked to list the grade they would be in for the school year 1969-70 and the school they would attend.

Since this part of the report is intended to give an overall description of the children who participated in the Summer Institute the remaining questions show how the pupils responded with no explanations listed. This kind of information might be valuable as summary information.

As the team of evaluators goes into the schools this fall, they will be interested in observing teacher techniques and the use of materials that help them improve instruction for children.

Conclusions

The Summer Reading Institute held at Raymond School July 7 through August 1 was sponsored by The Innovation Team of the Model School Division. The primary aim of the Institute was to provide classroom teachers of grades 4-6 special skills in classroom organization, teaching methodology, and the use of current materials and programs which would enable teachers to integrate reading and language arts in a total program.

A sincere effort was made to teach and demonstrate to teachers, in a classroom situation, innovative techniques for working with youngsters in the present day Urban School. Varied and sequential activities were planned.

The Innovation Team sensed from the very inception of this project that to do the things noted above would demand much planning, preparation, contact, and use of a large staff. Thus, they planned in great detail, drew consultants from various fields, established contact with many educational agencies and sought the services of an evaluation team.

This is how the Department of Research and Evaluation became involved. The Innovation Team was aware of the need for building in an evaluation scheme during the planning stages of the program. This makes for worthwhile and relevant programming. More specifically, formulating a program of evaluation from the inception of a project provides a monitoring system whereby evaluation provides an input for regular and systematic feedback. As the Summer Reading Institute evolved, Innovation Team members and participants:

1. Helped plan the institute.
2. Participated in the selection process.
3. Met with evaluation team.
4. Designed the format for the three day human relations training.
5. Determined classroom organization.
6. Designed plans for working with the children in groups or individually.
7. Held staff meetings to plan and iron out obstacles that might have created problems.
8. Scheduled feed back conferences of group participants in order that everyone could benefit from the experiences of another group.
9. Made a concentrated effort to help all participants develop an awareness of themselves and to focus on their roles and actions and how they would affect a classroom of children desirous of learning relevant curriculum.
10. Provided a setting whereby participants would accept and respect the language of the Urban child.

A number of observations were made by members of the evaluation team as to what actually took place during the Institute. The Institute:

1. Involved a specific number of teachers for the purpose of training and retraining to work with urban youngsters.
2. Used mass media for developing learning situations.
3. Used children as experimentors and demonstrators.
4. Taught children to use logic and reasoning.

5. Increased teachers awareness of the need to be honest with themselves and above all to be honest with children.

6. Developed an awareness of the importance of being open and objective when dealing with children.

7. Suggested that teachers lead children into making responsible decisions for themselves.

8. Provided new and varied materials for children with special needs.

9. Taught teachers to reassess a meaning for "Reading" before attempting to teach it.

10. Suggested that teachers reevaluate the concept of readiness.

11. Led teachers to establishing expectations for themselves and leading children into establishing individual and group expectations for the concerned body. (In this instance the classroom)

12. Provided means of assessing ways of determining specific skills children have and how to help each child develop those the teacher feels he needs.

13. Helped teachers become concerned with "attitudes".

14. Emphasized that teachers should be aware of the many problems involved in how they set up classrooms for Individualized Instruction.

15. Pointed out that teachers should make use of records, pictures, comic strips, etc., on a daily basis.

16. Helped teachers recognize the importance of creating a good atmosphere for learning.

17. Established importance of teachers remembering that they are facilitators of learning.

18. Tried to show the merits of teachers focusing attention on the child and away from the teacher.

When visiting classrooms during the Fall of 1969, the above observations will serve as guidelines for evaluating objectives of the institute.

In summary, it is felt that many learnings did take place and that the majority of the participants will put their new learnings to work once they have established their own classrooms. The Innovation Team

will be available to lend support to the teachers and the Evaluation Team will be close by to offer constructive suggestions for implementing the objectives.

Suggested Future Activities

For the Innovation Team, the Summer Institute provided the testing ground for a new level of their own development. As seen by the team from the Department of Evaluation and Research, the organization and administration of the Summer Reading Institute showed continued growth by the Innovation Team. The Institute was well planned and carefully and sequentially conducted from its initial development through the completion of the summer session.

Suggestions are made at this point to guide future activities similar to already existing philosophies of the Innovation Team.

The Innovation Team should:

1. Maintain personal contact with members of their summer groups by:
   a. Visiting teachers in their classrooms.
   b. Helping teachers use new materials.
   c. Setting up classrooms.
   d. Helping teachers explain the program to school principals, supervisory personnel, other interested teachers, and parents.
   e. Making themselves available to teachers who may have questions.
   f. Providing reassurance to teachers who do not get their programs off the ground from the very beginning.
   f. Helping teachers organize classrooms wherein individualized learning can take place.
2. Demonstrate use of new techniques, materials, etc.
3. Continue to conduct workshops so that all teachers involved can benefit from each other.

4. Conduct informal get togethers in order that teachers can exchange "findings" on an informal basis.

5. Use a team approach to help teachers who may have difficulty conducting his/her program.

It is recommended that the Innovation Team members keep a record of the number of times they enter a teacher's classroom for the purpose of providing help, and, that they make a note of the kind of help provided. The Evaluation Team needs this kind of information in the conducting of its evaluation.

A final list of recommendations is made in the form of what the Innovation Team and the Evaluation Team should look for when visiting the various teachers' classrooms. These grew out of developments of the Summer Institute. Teachers who participated in the Summer Institute will be looked at in terms of the items listed below, such as:

1. Organization of the classroom.

2. Activity oriented classroom centers as opposed to colorful irrelevant centers.

3. Use of centers by teachers and children.

4. Use of reciprocal learning; using strong children to help weaker children.

5. Making use of a variety of materials when presenting concepts for reading.

6. Teachers working as a resource person and encouraging children to take the lead.

7. The physical make up of the classroom.

8. Teacher's willingness to accept children's own views, view points and anecdotes.

9. Teacher's tolerance for divergent thinking.

10. Teacher talking less, children more.

11. Teacher's establishment of respect for and from children.

12. Teacher's means of helping Urban Children improve their self-image.

13. Amount of individual attention given to chidren.

14. Teacher's means of helping children understand that "Reading is infinite".

15. Classroom routine.

16. Teacher's handling of unexpected activities in the classroom.

17. Questioning technique employed by the teacher. (Is the teacher teaching children to ask questions for the purpose of problem solving?)

18. Use of pictures taken for story development.

19. Frequency of allowing children to take pictures.

20. Use of cartoons for developing child's story.

21. Evidence of child-centered bulletin boards.

22. Use of newspaper articles for reading.

23. Centers

    a. Who set them up?

    b. Who uses them?

    c. What's in the center?

    d. Are there any living things, etc.?

24. Observing children's writings, stories, poems, books, etc., at various points.

25. Use of manipulative, colorful materials.

26. Use of human and neuter resources.

27. Evidence of all kinds of work on display rather than our best work or all good papers or all perfect papers.

28. Looking for freedom of movement.

29. Noting availability and use of hardware.

30. Noting rapport between teacher and pupil.

31. Observing teacher's ability to work with the child who is seemingly not interested.

32. Degree of discipline problems.

These then will be some of the concepts that one might look at when visiting a classroom. No attempt will be made to evaluate any one of these items upon the first visit made. After subsequent visits, a formal checklist will be utilized and a written evaluation will be recorded. In-depth interviews will also be conducted for the purpose of making some assessment of how well participants are putting to use that which they learned in the Summer '69 Institute.

Teachers will be visited at the following schools: Bancroft, Bundy, Cleveland, H. D. Cooke, Garrison, Grimke, Harrison, Meyer, Monroe, Morse, Parkview, and Raymond on an unannounced basis. Principals and teachers have been notified of such visits by The Evaluation Team. See Appendices three and four.

As a result of the findings made by the Evaluation Team, one recommendation for the school system is that the teaching personnel and its supportive staff be involved in planning the entire program for the academic school year. This could be done in a campus setting one or two weeks before the opening of school.

Appendix I

Name of Participant _____

DEPARTMENT OF EVALUATION AND RESEARCH
DIVISION OF PLANNING, INNOVATION, AND RESEARCH
JULY, 1969

An Opinionnaire To The
Participants of the
Summer Reading Institute
Raymond School

The Department of Research and Evaluation has been working with members of the Innovation Team. We are interested in getting your opinions and reactions relative to the Institute. It would also be helpful to have some background information, so will you please respond to the following: (We assure you that this information will be treated confidentially. Your name will not appear on any of the released reports.)

Please check the blanks which apply.

1. _____ Teacher _____ T.A.P. Aide _____ Innovation Team Member

_____ Parent _____ Other

2. Sex: _____ Male _____ Female

3. Age: _____ Under Twenty _____ 20-25 _____25-30 _____ Over 30

4. Number of years of school related work experience:

_____ None _____ Approximately one year _____ more than 1 year but less than three _____ 3 to 5 years _____ 5 to 10 years

_____ more than ten years

4 (b). How many years of this work experience has been teaching?

_____ None _____ approximately one year _____ more than one but less than 3 years _____ 3 to 5 years _____ 5 to 10 years

_____ more than ten years

5. What grade did you work with last school year?

_____ 4th _____ 5th _____ 6th _____ combination of grades _____ other

6. What grade would you prefer working with?

_____ 4th _____ 5th _____ 6th _____ combination of grades _____ other

7. How many years have you worked in summer school?

_____ one _____ two _____ three _____ four _____ five

_____ more than five

8. How many years have you attended a Summer Institute other than formal course work?

_____ none _____ one _____ two _____ three ____ more than three

(b) Was it under the direction of the Innovation Team?

_____ Yes _____ No

(c) Check the sponsors of the Institutes you have attended

_____ D. C. School sponsored

_____ University sponsored

_____ Other agencies

9. How many workshops did you attend during the last school year?

_____ none _____ one _____ two _____ three _____ more than three

(b) Please list the content areas covered by the Institutes which you have attended.

_____ _____

_____ _____

10. Do you think that these workshops were of assistance to you in doing your school related job?

_____ very valuable _____ valuable _____ little valuable

_____ no value at all

11. In your opinion when would be the best time for school personnel to attend workshops?

_____ Beginning of school year _____ Semester break

_____ Closing of School _____ Summer _____ Other

(a). When should these workshops be scheduled?

_____ Weekdays 8:30 - 3:00

_____ Weekdays Half day

_____ Weekdays 3:30 - 5:00

_____ Weekdays 7:30 - 9:30

_____ Saturdays Half day

_____ Saturdays All day

12. Would you be willing to attend a workshop during the school year without pay?

_____ Yes _____ No

If no, indicate the amount of pay acceptable _____

13. How many years have you served as a student-parent/teacher aide?

_____ None _____ One _____ Two _____ Three _____ more than three

Please answer the questions.

14. The most exciting new idea that I learned during the three day workshop was _____

_____

_____

15. What do you see as the greatest obstacle in carrying out the objectives of the seminar when you actually begin to work in the classroom in September? _____

_____

_____

_____

16. Please list any recommendations you may have for other similar summer Institutes. _____

_____

_____

_____

Part II

Please respond to the statements by using, Strongly Agree (SA), Agree (A), Disagree (D), Strongly Disagree (SD).

1. My reason for becoming involved in school-related work is because:

a.	of an interest in children	____	SA	____	A	____	D ____ SD
b.	of financial benefits	____	SA	____	A	____	D ____ SD
c.	of many avenues of employment	____	SA	____	A	____	D ____ SD
d.	of much academic freedom	____	SA	____	A	____	D ____ SD
e.	it makes for democratic living	____	SA	____	A	____	D ____ SD
f.	it is a way to contribute to society	____	SA	____	A	____	D ____ SD

2. In the District of Columbia teachers are:

a.	highly regarded by parents	____	SA	____	A	____	D ____ SD
b.	not regarded as professionals in the community	____	SA	____	A	____	D ____ SD
c.	highly regarded by students	____	SA	____	A	____	D ____ SD
d.	highly regarded by the community	____	SA	____	A	____	D ____ SD
e.	highly regarded among themselves	____	SA	____	A	____	D ____ SD

3. The effectiveness of teaching in the District of Columbia should be measured by:

a.	children's achievement	____	SA	____	A	____	D ____ SD
b.	children's acceptance without questioning the teacher	____	SA	____	A	____	D ____ SD
c.	changes in the attitudes of children	____	SA	____	A	____	D ____ SD
d.	children's interaction with others	____	SA	____	A	____	D ____ SD
e.	children's ability to adjust to new situations	____	SA	____	A	____	D ____ SD
f.	all children making high marks	____	SA	____	A	____	D ____ SD

4. The success of any educational program designed for inner city youngsters depends upon:

   a. provision of material goods to students _____ SA _____ A _____ D _____ SD

   b. the cooperative efforts of school personnel and community workers _____ SA _____ A _____ D _____ SD

   c. use of paraprofessionals _____ SA _____ A _____ D _____ SD

   d. relevant curriculum _____ SA _____ A _____ D _____ SD

   e. strongly structured classroom setting _____ SA _____ A _____ D _____ SD

5. Many people feel that for a number of reasons there should be more male teachers in the District of Columbia because:

   a. inner city children relate faster to males _____ SA _____ A _____ D _____ SD

   b. there is an absence of a strong male image in many homes _____ SA _____ A _____ D _____ SD

   c. male teachers tend to be stronger disciplinarians _____ SA _____ A _____ D _____ SD

   d. male teachers are more sincerely committed to the teaching profession _____ SA _____ A _____ D _____ SD

   e. male teachers are better teachers in inner city classrooms _____ SA _____ A _____ D _____ SD

6. The achievement scores of inner-city youngsters should be compared with:

   a. own peers _____ SA _____ A _____ D _____ SD

   b. local community _____ SA _____ A _____ D _____ SD

   c. urban cities _____ SA _____ A _____ D _____ SD

   d. national norms _____ SA _____ A _____ D _____ SD

7. Existing standardized achievement tests should be:

   a. used _____ SA _____ A _____ D _____ SD

   b. eliminated _____ SA _____ A _____ D _____ SD

   c. modified _____ SA _____ A _____ D _____ SD

   d. entirely changed 37 SA _____ A _____ D _____ SD

8. It is my feeling that inner city children in the District of Columbia generally achieve:

   a. faster than children from better environments _____ SA _____ A _____ D _____ SD

   b. slower than children from other environments _____ SA _____ A _____ D _____ SD

   c. as well as children from other environments _____ SA _____ A _____ D _____ SD

9. Teaching techniques with inner city children should be:

   a. life like _____ SA _____ A _____ D _____ SD

   b. flexible _____ SA _____ A _____ D _____ SD

   c. highly structured _____ SA _____ A _____ D _____ SD

   d. range from simple to difficult ____ SA _____ A _____ D _____ SD

10. I feel that the classroom teacher should be:

   a. an authority figure _____ SA ____ A _____ D _____ SD

   b. a resource person _____ SA ____ A _____ D _____ SD

   c. a substitute parent _____ SA ____ A _____ D _____ SD

   d. a moderator rather than a giver of information _____ SA _____ A ____ D _____ SD

Part III.

Before attending the Reading Incentive Seminar, you must have had some ideas as to what the seminar would be like. You probably asked, how will this seminar help me in working with children. Listed below are a number of statements regarding possible expectations by participants. Therefore, we are asking that you rate the following statements using very well, well, not well, or not at all. The Seminar will:

1. Help me identify children's needs.

   _____ very well _____ well _____ not well _____ not at all

2. Give clues for understanding children's needs.

   _____ very well _____ well _____ not well _____ not at all

3. Provide possible solutions to meet children's needs.

   _____ very well _____ well _____ not well _____ not at all

4. Develop ways of motivating children.

   _____ very well _____ well _____ not well _____ not at all

5. Provide varied and innovative gimmicks for motivating inner-city children.

   _____ very well _____ well _____ not well _____ not at all

6. Provide innovative teaching techniques in reading and other content areas.

   _____ very well _____ well _____ not well _____ not at all

7. Give training in the use of devices used to measure academic growth of children.

   _____ very well _____ well _____ not well _____ not at all

8. Provide help in assessing attitudes of teachers, students, school personnel and parents.

   _____ very well _____ well _____ not well _____ not at all

9. Provide training that will lead to a change in attitudes.

   _____ very well _____ well _____ not well _____ not at all

10. Make all participants aware of the need for self-evaluation.

    _____ very well _____ well _____ not well _____ not at all

11. Promote better working relationships for entire school staff.

    _____ very well _____ well _____ not well _____ not at all

12. Improve working relationships with parents and other community agencies.

    _____ very well _____ well _____ not well _____ not at all

13. Make school personnel aware of varied school and community resources.

_____ very well _____ well _____ not well _____ not at all

14. Promote a sharing of ideas, techniques, and physical resources.

_____ very well _____ well _____ not well _____ not at all

15. Identify varied audio-visual equipment.

_____ very well _____ well _____ not well _____ not at all

16. Develop skills in the use of new audio-visual equipment.

_____ very well _____ well _____ not well _____ not at all

17. Instruct use of classroom centers as a laboratory of learning rather than a beautifying fixture in the classroom.

_____ very well _____ well _____ not well _____ not at all

18. Instruct in the development of reasonable behavioral objectives.

_____ very well _____ well _____ not well _____ not at all

19. Teach use of behavioral objectives in making long and short-range plans.

_____ very well _____ well _____ not well _____ not at all

20. Serve as a motivator for the regular school year program.

_____ very well _____ well _____ not well _____ not at all

Appendix 2

FILMED FROM BEST AVAILABLE COPY

Name: _____

STUDENT CHECKLIST

Please check the blank which applies.

1. Sex: _____ Boy _____ Girl

2. Grade Completed: ____ 4th _____ 5th _____ 6th _____ Other

3. Age: _____ 9 _____10 _____ 11 _____ 12 _____ 13 _____ Other

4. School you went to last year _____.

5. School you will go to next year _____.

6. What grade will you be in next year? _____.

7. Have you gone to summer school before? _____ Yes _____ No

8. How many summers have you gone to school? _____ None _____ One _____ Two _____ Three _____ More than three.

9. Did you enjoy summer school last summer? _____ Lot _____ Somewhat _____ Not at all.

9a. Do you think you will enjoy summer school this summer? _____ Lot _____ Somewhat _____ Not at all.

10. How did you like your teacher last summer? _____ Lot _____ Somewhat _____ Not at all.

10a. Do you think you will enjoy your teacher this summer? _____ Lot _____ Somewhat _____ Not at all.

11. Is your teacher a man or woman? _____ Man _____ Woman

12. What do you like best about summer?

_____ Going swimming

_____ Staying at home

_____ Going to summer school

_____ Taking a vacation with your parents

_____ Other

13. Which of the following is your favorite subject?

_____ Reading _____ Math _____ Language Arts _____ Science

FILMED FROM BEST AVAILABLE COPY

14. Which subject do you think you will enjoy most this summer?

_____ Reading _____ Math _____ Language Arts _____ Science

15. If you could do anything you wished this summer, what would you do?

_____

_____

_____

16. Do you think children should go to summer school? ____ Yes ____ No

17. Did your mother and father want you to go to summer school? __ Yes __ No

18. How many brothers and sisters do you have going to summer school this summer? ____ None ____ One ____ Two ____ Three ____ More Than three

19. Which teacher would you prefer having?

_____ A young lady

_____ An older lady

_____ A young man

_____ An older man

20. I am going to summer school because:

_____ I did poorly last year

_____ I like school

_____ I want to learn more

_____ I have nothing else to do

_____ My parents wanted me to attend.

_____ Other

21. What did you do last week? _____

_____

_____

22. Would you have liked summer school to have started earlier in the summer?

_____ Yes _____ No

Department of Evaluation and Research
Division of Planning, Innovation and Research
July, 1969

Appendix 3

PUBLIC SCHOOLS OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
DIVISION OF PLANNING, INNOVATION AND RESEARCH
PRESIDENTIAL BUILDING
415 - 12TH STREET, N. W.
WASHINGTON, D. C. 20004

September 19, 1969

Memorandum to:

From: Dr. Mildred P. Cooper
Acting Assistant Superintendent

Subject: Summer Institute - Raymond School

The Innovation Team of the Model School Divison sponsored an Institute for teachers of the Model Schools - July 7, 1969 - August 1, 1969. The Department of Evaluation and Research was asked to evaluate the institute and the follow-up work of the institute.

As a part of the plan approved by the Innovation Team for an evaluation, a member of the team of evaluators from the Department of Evaluation and Research will be visiting classrooms of participants in your building at some unannounced date early this fall. It will be one of the persons who worked with the team this past summer; namely, Robert Humbles, Jr. and/or George R. Taylor.

Should you have a question, please call me within a week. My number is 347-6383. If I do not hear from you, I will assume that we have your approval.

The participating teachers were:

Thank you for your cooperation.

MPC/jrw

Appendix 4

PUBLIC SCHOOLS OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
DIVISION OF PLANNING, INNOVATION AND RESEARCH
PRESIDENTIAL BUILDING
415 - 12TH STREET, N. W.
WASHINGTON, D. C. 20004

September 19, 1969

Memorandum to:

From: Dr. Mildred P. Cooper
Acting Assistant Superintendent

Subject: Summer Institute - Raymond School

As planned with the Innovation Team a member of the team of evaluators from the Department of Research and Evaluation will be visiting your classroom at some unannounced date early this fall. It will be one of the persons you worked with this past summer; namely, Robert Humbles, Jr. or George R. Taylor.

Should you have a question, please call me within a week. My number is 347-6383. If I do not hear from you, I will assume that we have your approval.

MPC/onj